

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed February 28, 2003.

§103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-9, 14-15, 20-29, 34, and 36-42 were rejected under §103 as being unpatentable over Brandle et al. in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA).

Claims 2, 10-13, 16-19, 30-33, 35 and 43-46 were rejected under §103 as being unpatentable over Brandle et al. in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA) and further in view of Wadhwa.

Claims 1, 20, and 34

The Office Action relies on the Brandle reference as teaching calling an entry point function of a shared library, where the entry point function is associated with a program. However, the Office Action admits that “Brandle does not explicitly teach a graphical program executing in response to calling of an entry point function of a shared library.” The Office Action relies on Applicant’s admitted prior art (APA) as teaching execution of a graphical program through a shared library, citing page 5 of the Background section of the application. However, this portion of the specification describes one prior art approach which involves “creating a DLL that has entry points that call a graphical program indirectly by interfacing with an Active X out-of-process server, where this Active X server is operable to invoke the desired graphical program.” This prior art approach is an indirect way for “enabling graphical programs to be called using shared libraries.” This prior art approach suffers from a number of drawbacks, particularly relating to efficiency and the requirement that the user create an Active X out-of-process server specifically for this purpose.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 3, and claim 3 has been cancelled. As amended, claim 1 recites that the entry point function invokes the graphical program in response to calling the entry point function. Applicant notes that in the prior art approach discussed at page 5, the entry point is first required to call an

out-of-process Active X server, and the user is required to configure the out-of-process Active X server to then invoke the graphical program. Thus, the prior art does not teach or suggest calling an entry point function of a shared library, where this entry point function directly invokes the graphical program. Applicant further submits that the Brandle patent and prior art relating to graphical programs are not analagous due to the very different nature of graphical programs and text based programs. Thus, Applicant submits that the attempted combination of APA and the Brandle reference is not supportable. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 1 and those dependent thereon are allowable. Applicant submits that amended claim 20 is allowable for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Applicant also submits that amended claim 34 is allowable for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant further submits that various other of the dependent claims are independently allowable. For example, claim 4 recites “wherein the graphical program comprises executable code included in the shared library.” This differs greatly from APA, where the graphical program is NOT part of the shared library. Applicant submits that including the graphical program as part of the shared library has a number of benefits over the prior art.

Claims 16 and 30

Claim 16 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandle et al. in the admitted prior art (APA) and further in view of Wadhwa et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 16 recites as follows:

A computer-implemented method for creating a shared library including a graphical program, the method comprising:
selecting a graphical program in response to user input;
specifying a functional interface for the graphical program;
creating a shared library comprising the graphical program,
wherein the shared library includes a function created according to the functional interface specified for the graphical program.

Applicant submits that the cited prior art does not teach the elements of claim 16 either singly or in combination. Applicant notes that the Wadhwa reference discusses generally building a new program into an executable program or dynamic linked library

(DLL). However, the Office Action admits that “Wadhwa does not explicitly teach a graphical program, specifying a functional interface for the graphical program, and the shared library includes a function created according to the functional interface.” The APA referred to in the Office Action at most refers to using a shared library to call an Active X out-of-process server which itself is configured to invoke a desired graphical program. However, Applicant submits this is entirely different than creating a shared library comprising a graphical program. In fact, Applicant submits that the indirect method discussed at page 5 of the patent specification teaches away from the method of claim 16, where a shared library is created that comprises the graphical program. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 16 and those dependent thereon are allowable. Applicant submits that claim 30 and those dependent thereon are allowable for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 16.

Therefore, Applicant submits that the present claims are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5150-39900/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- Return Receipt Postcard
- Request for Approval of Drawing Changes
- Notice of Change of Address
- Check in the amount of \$ for fees ().
- Other:

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey C. Hood
Reg. No. 35,198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 5/29/2003